

REMARKS**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103**

Claim 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al. (US 5,592,609). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

(1) Suzuki et al. fail to teach, “said storage device having a storage medium and a firmware” as recited in Claim 1.

The Examiner indicates that the storage device of Claim 1 is the hard disk drive 28 (HDD 28, FIG. 1A of US 5,592,609), the storage medium of Claim 1 is CPU 228 (FIG. 2A of US 5,592,609); and the firmware of Claim 1 is BIOS 234 (FIG. 2A of US 5,592,609). However, unlike the teaching of Claim 1, HDD 28 does not include CPU 228 (storage medium) and BIOS 234 (firmware). As shown in FIGs. 1A and 2B, CPU 228 and BIOS 234 are located within the console 2 while HDD 28 is located on the outside of the console 2. Therefore, HDD 28 doesn't contain CPU 228 and BIOS 234.

(2) Suzuki et al. fail to teach the subject matter of Claim 1: “A method for write-disabling a storage device”.

As the aforementioned, the Examiner indicates that the storage device of Claim 1 is HDD 28. However, US 5,592,609 nowhere teaches a write-disabling method related to HDD 28. More specifically, in view of the entire content of US 5,592,609, there are only two places mentioned about HDD 28. One is in column 6, line 60 of the specification, which describes that HDD 28 is one of the peripheral devices for the console 2, and is coupled with various additional I/O components. The other is in

column 27, line 9-15, which describes a hardware status check for HDD 28 as well as other peripheral devices. Accordingly, no method for write-disabling HDD 28 (storage device) is taught by Suzuki et al. in US 5,592,609.

(3) Suzuki et al. fail to teach “processing device writing and reading data from said storage medium” as recited in Claim 1.

The Examiner indicates that the storage medium of Claim 1 is CPU 228, and the processing device of Claim 1 is the personal computer in US 5,592,609 (i.e. referring to Col. 3, lines 8-14, the personal computer is one of the peripheral devices coupling with the game processing console 2). However, US 5,592,609 nowhere teaches the personal computer (processing device) writing and reading data from CPU 228 (storage medium). More specifically, in view of the entire content of US 5,592,609, there are only two places mentioned about the personal computer. One is in the abstract, which describes that the personal computer is one of the peripheral devices for the console 2. The other is in column 3, lines 8-14, which also describes the personal computer is one of the peripheral devices for the console 2. Accordingly, US 5,592, 609 nowhere teaches that the personal computer (processing device) can write and read data from CPU 228 (storage medium).

(4) Suzuki et al. fail to teach, “said firmware receives a write command from said processing device” as recited in Claim 1.

The Examiner indicates that the firmware of Claim 1 is BIOS 234, and the processing device of Claim 1 is the personal computer of US 5,592,609. As aforementioned, Suzuki et al. only teach that the personal computer is one of the peripheral devices for the console 2. No further information about the personal

computer is taught. Accordingly, US 5,592,609 nowhere teaches the BIOS (firmware) receiving a write command from the personal computer (processing device).

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. in view of Kobayashi et al. (US 2004/0042363). Applicant traverses the rejection.

In view of the above comparisons, it should be understood that the present invention is different from US 5,592,609, and that Suzuki et al. fail to disclose several elements of Claim 1, from which Claims 11 and 12 depend. The addition of Kobayashi et al. does not cure this deficiency. Therefore, Claim 1 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by Suzuki et al. alone or in combination with the other references relied upon by Examiner. The rejections of Claims 1 together with Claims 2-12 depended thereon are respectfully traversed.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/27/06

By: 

Cynthia L. Pillote
Reg. No. 42,999

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
Phone: (602) 382-6296
Fax: (602) 382-6070
Email: cpillote@swlaw.com